REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 7, and 10 as being indefinite. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the computer server, in response to receiving the content from the content providers, provides the content from each of the content providers to a device and/or the recipient.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 9, 11-30 as being anticipated by Lazaridis et al.

Lazaridis et al. disclose a system for pushing information from a host system to a mobile data communication device upon sensing a triggering event. A redirector program operating at the host system enables a user to continuously redirect certain user-selected data items from the host system to the user's mobile data communication device upon detecting that one or more user-defined triggering events has occurred. The redirector program operates in connection with event generating applications and repackaging systems at the host system to configure and detect a particular user-defined event, and then to repackage the user-selected data items in an electronic wrapper prior to pushing the data items to the mobile device.

In particular, the Examiner suggests that the user registers with the redirector software operating at the server. Accordingly, the desktop computer (Figure 1) or server computer (Figure 2) 10 and redirector software 12 are identified by the Examiner as the registration process at the server. In addition, the redirector software includes the address of the destination device.

In particular, the Examiner suggests that the redirector software operating on the computer 10 includes a "user profile" which indicates which received messages should be redirected. The Examiner further suggested that the desktops 10, 26, and 28 (see Figure 1) are "content providers" since presumably messages for the user may originate at each of them.

Appl. No. 09/782,910 Amdt. dated Sept. 22, 2005

Reply to Office Action of Jun. 10, 2004

Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over Lazaridis et al. by claiming that the computer server (e.g., computer 10) provides the identifier to a plurality of different content providers (e.g., computer 10, 26, 28). In contrast, the computer server 10 of Lazaridis et al. merely receives content that happens to be sent to the user from the content providers.

In particular, the Examiner also suggests that Lazaridis et al. teach identifying desirable content at column 7, lines 15-18 and providing the content provider with the ID at column 11, lines 8-9. The redirector 12 operating on the computer 10 of Lazaridis et al. identifies content that has been sent to it from another source or an internal event, and redirects it to the user. At most, Lazaridis et al. disclose that the user provides some sort of identification to only the computer server, but not to a plurality of content providers.

Claim 1 further patentably distinguishes over Lazaridis et al. by claiming at least one of the recipient and the device providing the identifier to a plurality of different content providers. In contrast, Lazaridis et al. at most has an identifier provided to the computer server (i.e., also content provider).

Claim 1 further patentably distinguishes over Lazaridis et al. by claiming each of the content providers in response to having the identifier identifying respective content desirable to the recipient. In contrast, Lazaridis et al. at most has <u>only</u> the redirector computer server identify content in response to the identifier.

In particular, the Examiner also suggested that Lazaridis et al. teach the content provider providing the content to the server that is free or independent of the server or "gateway" requesting the content, wherein the components of the LAN or WAN are acting in a server role.

Claims 2-30 depend from claim1 and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 1.

Appl. No. 09/782,910 Amdt. dated Sept. 22, 2005

Reply to Office Action of Jun. 10, 2004

Applicant submits herewith a Request for Continued Examination, a petition for a one-month extension of time, and a check in the amount of \$910.00. If it deemed that additional fees are required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 03-1550.

Respectfully submitted,

CHERNOFF, VILHAUER, McCLUNG & STENZEL

Kevin L. Russell, Reg. No. 38,292

1600 ODS Tower 601 SW Second Avenue Portland, OR 97204

Tel: 503-227-5631 Fax: 503-228-4373

Dated: September 22, 2005